

CACCC Meeting Report

October 7, 2003

Nashville, Indiana

Attendees:

Council members: Chuck Bauer, Paula Yeager, Pete Hanebutt, Frank Keeton, David Dimmich, Doug Metcalf, Doug Allman, Glenn Lange, Gene Hopkins, Brad Thurston
Facilitator: Tom Wasson; Recorder: Jeanne Odaffer; Secretary: Debbie Bray

Guests: 10-15 members of the public attended various portions of the meeting.

Meeting Agenda Topics:

1. Housekeeping & Meeting Logistics
2. Review/Approval of September Meeting Report
3. Resource Material Review
4. Presentation by Dr. Garland , BOAH
5. Public Input - Morning
6. Issues: Clarify & Combine
7. Resolving Issues
8. Public Input - Afternoon
9. What Next?

Meeting Notes:

Agenda was reviewed. A council member suggested to allow for Public Comment before continuing with meeting as requested by attending Public. Accepted by Council.

Public Comment:

Comment #1 - Hoping for resolution, has CWD concerns with penned hunts. Feel it is a threat to future of sport. Does not see a need for them (penned hunts).

Comment #2 - Ethical concerns and CWD because we don't know how to stop disease. Wants to keep deer wild in Indiana.

Comment #3 - Unethical to hunt only for racks.

Comment #4 - See no reason to allow transporting of deer with CWD a threat. "For profit" type of hunting should not continue. Sees no reason to give regulation control to different Agency other than DNR. Deer should not be "farm" animal. Not just hunting public is interested. Should have Public Referendum. Should have Public input: survey/referendum.

Comment #5 - Question was asked as to next meeting date. Clarified meeting date: November 19, 2003, Wednesday.

1. HOUSE KEEPING AND MEETING LOGISTICS

- A short discussion of the role of resource people. The primary role is to provide or clarify facts for the council members. They will not be part of the discussion unless specifically requested. Any council members may call on a resource person in attendance.
- Reviewed the previously approved Ground Rules
- Debbie Bray discussed arrangements for lunch and gave an overview of current expenditures.

2. REVIEW/APPROVAL OF SEPTEMBER MEETING REPORT

Frank Keeton provided additions and corrections to Council and recorder to be added to minutes.

Correction to Dr. Cunningham's fence requirements "high voltage/ Low amps"

Gene Hopkins was charged to call Dr. Cunningham regarding question as to statement clarification.

Discussion of Council regarding Professional presentations was made to record the presentation and keep a tape for Council review and reference. This would provide an exact record of presentation.

Meeting notes were approved with changes and clarification of Dr. Cunningham's statement.

3. RESOURCE MATERIAL REVIEW

- Copies of public comments were provided to council members
- **Paula:** will provide information from Michigan and Wisconsin.
- **Frank:** will provide break out of both studies: Now and 5 yrs ago concerning Elk and deer and other cervids if possible. A single copy of survey questions was requested.
- **Doug M.:** provided BOAH Mission Statement
- **Lt. Col. Jeff Wells:** clarification regarding Shooting Preserves: cannot sell deer hunting on same property as pheasant etc. are hunted.
- **Doug M.:** Clarification regarding gamebreeders licenses. Gamebreeder is required to notify BOAH upon death of deer. BOAH is not informed under what circumstances deer died under.
- **Glenn L.:** will add revenue to report, provide complete notebook for Council reference of State regulations for "penned cervid"
- **Pete:** provided information on economic value of beef cattle

4. PRESENTATION BY DR. GARLAND , BOAH

A copy her PowerPoint presentation will be provided to Council.

The council and Dr. Garland had considerable discussion, which was continued after lunch.

5. PUBLIC INPUT - MORNING

- Comment #1 We don't know enough about disease to put us at risk for disease.
- Comment #2 Confined animals – we don't know how spread- should not have farms, especially when other States are tightening regulations.
- Comment #3 There is no way to prove animals don't have it.(CWD) When are they exposed?
- Comment #4 Its' not a matter of opening the industry in Indiana but maintaining a viable industry already in place.
- Comment #5 Volunteer programs (CWD testing) allow for misuse on a variety of levels. No way to police.

LUNCH BREAK

QUESTIONS TO DR. GARLAND:

The following is a bullet list of answers given by Dr. Garland to questions asked by council members.

- Wild animals do get CWD
 - Maybe an environmental component to CWD
 - Research in captive animals – source animals come from wild and private owned
 - 4/1 ratio males get CWD more than females
 - Where did CWD come from in Wisconsin, Saskatchewan, Utah? ANS: Fort Collins, Colorado Research Facility. Dr. Garland has seen records which states deer were transported from Fort Collins, Colorado Research to Saskatchewan, Utah and Wisconsin
 - Affect population? No studies done as yet
 - Question to Dr. Garland, “What would you suggest to do if animals test positive in Indiana? Reply: There are two thoughts as to what to do:
 - A. Kill all affected animals
 - B. We can “manage” out of it
- There is no scientific evidence what works best when CWD comes to the State
- Dr. Garland believes if CWD comes it may walk in from the North West population of wild animals. If all movement of captive cervid were stopped there is likelihood there would still be CWD coming to the state.
 - It's not a matter of “if” but “when” we get CWD.
 - How other States manage population of deer is not under our control.
 - Captive deer private owned deer and farms should have different rules for farms – Animals are tested and have health history.

6. ISSUES: CLARIFY & COMBINE

After a review of the 36 existing Issue statements from the last Council meeting, the council quickly combined them into six issues.

- I Regulatory
- II Cervid Health
- III Harvest
- IV Social Impact
- V Economic
- VI Outliers - Deer Harbors

The Council broke into small groups of two members each to develop and bring back to the entire Council a rewrite statement about five of the six major Issues. (It was felt that the Issue “Economics” would be addressed while working on other issues and did not need to be handled at this time.)

Issue I- Regulatory

How will cervids be regulated and who will regulate?

Conflicts over regulations have made cervid management difficult

1. Outdated and confusing statues and Administrative Rules
2. Agency Responsibilities
3. Clear Definitions not Available
4. Define Captive vs. Free Ranging Cervids
5. Hunting behind wire
6. Health Issues A. Captive B. Free ranging

Issue II- Cervid Health

Decisions made by the Council should be based on best available science and reflect the need for the protection of “wild and farmed” cervids.

For the purpose of cervid health

1. Standard identification for animals and premises
2. Guidelines need to be developed for:
 - a. Fencing
 - b. Retrieval of escapees
 - c. Importation/exportation/ intra-state transit
 - d. Protection of native species from genetic pollution
 - e. Standards and an established process of reportable diseases:
Accountability & Enforcement
Post harvest surveillance

Issue III- Harvest

Hunting under IDNR regulations. Slaughter for meat and by products (under BOAH?)

If under Indiana law keeping cervids behind high fence is permitted, under what conditions is it acceptable?

1. DNR regulation assumes game rules for firearm and archery harvest of cervids. – Maybe different rules for private owned and wild free range – Restrictions on fair chase - baiting
2. Slaughter assumes cervid killed by “accepted packers and stock yards rules”
3. Issues # 4,6,9,12,13,16,17,19,20,21,23,26,30,31.

Issue IV- Social

Social Implications of captive cervid issues

As charged by the legislature, we are instructed to resolve conflicts concerning social, biological, and public interest issues pertaining to captive cervids. Our specific interest area is that of social concerns and how they impact hunters, farmers, and the tax paying general public.

1. Hunter ethics
2. Fair chase (wildlife as public trust)
3. Baiting
4. Antler I.D.
5. Fencing of Public Wildlife
6. Cost allocation (who is responsible?)
7. Negative perception of Non-Hunting public
8. Ecosystem impacts
9. # 29 + 32 (may be encompassed in other issues)

Issue VI- Outliers – Deer Harbors

How do we regulate the non-commercial possession of cervids?

Are there other cervid operations that may need regulation e.g. private petting zoo?

1. Cervids as pets?
2. Cervid rehabilitation?
3. Public deer behind high fence?
 - a. pleasure
 - b. protection
 - c. government
 - d. agriculture
 - e. industry
 - f. security

7. RESOLVING ISSUES

The Council determined they would begin with Issue VI – Outliers - re-named Deer Harbors. The following are bullet comments regarding the issue.

Rehabilitators of White-tailed Deer.

- ✓ Minimize opportunity
- ✓ Eliminate opportunity

- ✓ Eliminate taking for rehab
- ✓ No live deer taking from wild
- ✓ Do-gooder wants to “save
- ✓ Problems with C.O.
- ✓ Big social issue
- ✓ No rehabilitators on committee. Number of ways for input to committee.
- ✓ Make it illegal to remove a live native deer from the wild

Council made a preliminary decision to recommend stopping the rehabilitation of white tailed deer by making it illegal to remove a live native deer from the wild.

- ❖ Inform public not in best interest of deer herd
- ❖ Studies available for justification of stance
- ❖ Would like to have professional rehabber input

Council “**wants**” regarding Issue VI

- ✓ Study on survival of fawns
- ✓ Hear from C.O.
- ✓ Hear from rehabber

8. PUBLIC INPUT AFTERNOON

- 1# Is there really a problem with rehabbers? Will there be more controversy than its worth? Rehabber’s agenda is to put animal back
- 2# Against all fenced deer hunting

9. WHAT NEXT:

1. Wisconsin Speakers
 - a. Wildlife
 - b. Enforcement

Set aside an hour for each presentation
2. Dr. Garland attend as resource person allow 20 minutes
3. Law Enforcement representative to attend
4. Information needed. 1. number of rehabilitators in State 2. type of permits
5. Glenn to notify rehabbers of issue
6. Glenn to provide shooting preserves information. What other species are in shooting preserves, are there places that have exotics?
7. Finish Issue “Deer Harbor”
8. Start “Regulatory” Issue Need regulatory people DNR, C.O., BOAH
9. Where: Lafayette Area
10. When: 9:00 AM to 6:00 PM

Below are additional comments by Doug Metcalf. Council approved adding these to the October Meeting report on November 19, 2003

October 23, 2003

To: CACCC

From: Doug

Subject: Corrections - CACCC Minutes of October 7, 2003

1. Regarding **Questions to Dr. Garland** - The last bullet should be divided.
 - a. Captive white tail deer e.g. public white tail deer behind private high fence; privately owned cervids e.g. cervids kept as pets; and farm raised cervids e.g. privately owned cervids raised for a commercial purpose should have different rules.
 - b. Farm raised cervids follow typical commercial livestock husbandry practices including animal identification often with a pedigree and/or DNA record; veterinary care with disease testing, herd and individual animal health records; artificial insemination often with monitored birthing; supplemental feeding; etc.
2. Regarding 3. **RESOURCE MATERIAL REVIEW Doug M-** I would like to correct/clarify myself with respect to my comments as recorded.
 - a. BOAH does not license game breeders, DNR does. BOAH registers cervid farmers/people who own cervids.
 - b. People who are registered cervid farmers are required to report cervid mortalities to BOAH. When they report the mortality they are not required to have a diagnosis as to the cause of death. BOAH asks for information at the time of the mortality report to identify the age, sex, ID and suspected cause of death of the particular animal. The BOAH veterinarian who goes out to collect the sample will assess the circumstances under which the death occurred and will conduct a gross examination of the carcass if available (some carcasses are not available because it was a hunter harvest or the carcass was released because of inclement weather by the BOAH veterinarian receiving the report though the head and neck are preserved for BOAH). [Hunter harvest samples may not be collected by a veterinarian, but will always be collected by a trained member of the BOAH staff.] The BOAH veterinarian working the case is expected to conduct a thorough enough examination of the circumstances and/or carcass to determine what tissues need to be collected for diagnostic examination from a regulatory perspective. For example, an apparently healthy cervid in good body condition will typically have only brain and lymph tissues collected. On the other hand, a clearly diseased cervid may be subjected to a field necropsy or may be transported to the Animal Disease Diagnostic Laboratory for a full laboratory work up for regulatory purposes. On occasion the owner wants to determine the cause of death for his or her own management purposes. In these situations their private practice veterinarian arranges for the transport of the carcass to ADDL and orders a diagnostic workup. The owner pays for this service and BOAH orders necessary and specific diagnostic testing of the carcass for regulatory purposes.